

first circuit node. The Examiner contends that the first circuit node is pins HYB3 and HYB4 of Blon Figure 1.

During an Examiner Interview, the Examiner stated that a node can have a broad definition which encompasses a location in a circuit where a process happens, *i.e.*, that a node can be more than just a single physical point. The Examiner contends that the AGC element disclosed in Blon functions as a subtractor and meets this broader definition of “node.”

Amended claim 1 now recites the step of “subtracting the first echo compensation signal from the reconstructed received signal to produce a first compensated received signal by combining the first echo compensation signal and the reconstructed received signal at a first circuit junction point common to at least two circuit branches.” (Emphasis added.) In contrast, Blon discloses feeding tip and ring received signals (lines RTIP and RRING) and tip and ring replica echo signals (lines RRTIP and RRRING) to separate inputs of an AGC element that functions as a subtractor, where they are subtracted to provide the far end signal. (Blon, column 3, lines 62-67.) Providing these signals to different inputs of a subtractor is not the same as combining them at “a first circuit junction point common to at least two circuit branches” as now recited in claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Blon does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Blon does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-4 and 12 depend from claim 1, and Applicant submits that claims 2-4 and 12 are patentable over Blon for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Amended claim 5 now recites a first circuit branch and a second circuit branch connected “such that a reconstructed received signal and an echo compensation signal are combined and coupled at the receiver input junction point common to at least two circuit branches.” Applicant

submits that amended claim 5 distinguishes over Blon for at least the same reasons presented above for claim 1. Blon does not disclose each and every element of claim 5 and, thus, does not anticipate claim 5. Claims 6-8 depend from claim 5, and Applicant submits that claims 6-8 are patentable over Blon for at least the same reasons as claim 5.

Applicant requests withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

Each and every point raised in the Office Action dated January 29, 2004 has been addressed on the basis of the above amendments and remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1-12 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: June 1, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Richard J. Katz
Richard J. Katz

Registration No.: 47,698
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 753-6237 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant